CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE.

Sri B. B. SAYANAK (Belgaum).—Sir, I call the attention of the Hon'ble Minister for Agriculture and Education to the Hartal in Mudhol due to transfer of one Kannada Head Master of Primary School.

Sri K. V. SHANKARA GOWDA (Minister for Agriculture and Education).—Sir, according to information available to Government, the Swatantra Party of Mudhol held a meeting on 7th February 1968 and passed a Resolution for the immediate transfer of the present Head Master of the Taluk Primary School at Mudhol. On 8th February 1968, a procession was also organised in this connection and on 9th February 1968, some leaders and students were found squatting in front of the primary school. The leaders had planned for a Bundh on 11th February 1968 at Mudhol but the same did not succeed for want of public response. The Head Master of the School concerned is not due for transfer. Primary Schools in Bijapur District are under the School Board. Goverument do not propose to take action as a result of the agitation.

Members' Representations

ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್. ಎನ್. ನಂಜೇಗೌಡ (ಅರಕಲ್‌ಗೂಡು).—Sir, yesterday I sent a privilage motion notice regarding the statement made by the Hon'ble Minister Sri P. M. Nadagowda in the other house. ಅದು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲೂ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯ—ವಿಧಾನಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕೇವಲ ಗಲಾಟೆಮಾಡು ತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೆಡ್ ಲೈನ್ಸ್ ಕೂಡ ಬಂದಿದೆ.

ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ರಿಪೋರ್ಟು ಓದಬೇಡಿ.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್. ಎನ್. ನಂಜೇಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು 177ನೇ ರೂಲ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕಳಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದರ ಕೆಂಟೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕೇವಲ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ವಿಧಾನಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯರ್ಥ ಗೊಂದಲ ಗಲಾಟೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಕಾಲಹರಣ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸಚಿವರಾದವರಿಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲಿ ತಾನೆ ಕಾಲ ಸಿಗುತ್ತದೆ? ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಸಚಿವರು ಕೆಳಮನೆಯ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದು ಗಲಾಟೆ, ಗದ್ದಲ, ಗೊಂದಲಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಕಾಲಹರಣ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿ, ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಬರೀ ಕೆಟ್ಟವರು ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ನಮ್ಮ ಹಕ್ಕುಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗೆ ಭಂಗತರುವಂಥದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ. ಕಾರಣ ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲೂ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಥವಾ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆಯಾಗಲಿ, ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದು ನಮ್ಮ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗೆ ಭಂಗ ತರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವು ಅನುಮತಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ (ಶ್ರವಣಬೆಳಗೊಳ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ನಂಜೇಗೌಡರು ತುಂಬಿರತಕ್ಕ ಹಕ್ಕುಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಯ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ಅನುಮೋದಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಒಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇಂದು ಇದು ಸಭೆಯ ಘನತೆ ಗೌರವ ಹಾಗೂ ಗಾಂಭೀರ್ಯ ಹಾಗೂ ಇದು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ, ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಗುದ್ದಾಟ, ಜಗಳ ಮತ್ತು ವ್ಯರ್ಥ ಕಾಲಹರಣ ಮಾಡ ತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ತಪ್ಪು. ಇದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮಾನ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆ, ಮತ್ತು ಘನತೆ ಗೌರವಗಳಿಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ತರತಕ್ಕಂತಹ ಮಾತುಗಳು. ಇದು ಯಾರೇ ಮಾತನಾಡಲಿ, ಇದು ಈ

ಸಭೆಯ ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೆ ಕುಂದು ಬರುವ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದೂ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಮಾತನಾಡಕ್ಕೆ ಪದ ಒಬ್ಬ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯುತರಾದ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯುದಾಗಿ ಇವನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆಯೇ ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಗೌರವನ್ನು ಕುಂದು ಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರು ಯಾರೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಯಾವ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದವರೂ, ಅವರನ್ನು ರಿಕ್ಷಿಸಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ನಾಯಕರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಪಕ್ಷ ಯಾರಾ ಇಲ್ಲ. ನನ್ನ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅವರ ಕ್ಷಮಾಪಣೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆ. ಇದು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೆ ಕುಂದು ತರಕ್ಕ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ, ಕೇವಲ ಹಗುರವಾಗಿ ಗುವಾ ಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ವ್ಯರ್ಥಗೊಂದಲ ಗದಾಜೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಅದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆಯನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿ ಹಿಡಿಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದೂ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರ ಬಾಯಿಂದ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಮಾತಲ್ಲ ಇದು. ಅದು ಯಾರೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾ ನಾಯಕರು ಅವರ ಕ್ಷಮಾಪಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಅವರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪ (ಹರಿಹರ).—ಈಗ ಒಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಇವರು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ, ನಾನು ಹಿಂದೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಮಂತ್ರಿಯಾಗಲು ಶುದ್ಧ ನಾರಾಯಕು ಎಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತ ಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದೆ. ಈಗ ಅವರು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ಪುಷ್ಟೀಕರಿಸಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—He must also use good language.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ಧವೀರಪ್ಪ.—ಅವರು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ವರ್ತನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಾವು ಏನಾದರೂ ಅನ್‌ಪಾರ್ಲಮೆಂಟರಿ ಶಬ್ದ, ಅಥವಾ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಶಬ್ದ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ತಾವು ಇದ್ದೀರಿ. ಒಟ್ಟು ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ಅವರು ದೇಶದ ಮುಂದೆ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಗೊಂದಲ, ಸಮ್ಮನೆ ಗದಾಜೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಇವರು ತಂಟೆಕೋರರು ರೀತಿ ಇದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಎನ್ನುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾವು ಬಯಸಿ ಮುಚ್ಚಿ ಕೊಂಡು ಕೂತುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ಇವರ ಹುಳುಕು ತೆಗೆದು ತೋರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ಇವರು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಏನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿ ತೋರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅವರು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯುತವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ, ಬೇರೆ ಕಡೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಅಕ್ಷಮ್ಯ ಅಪರಾಧ. ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೆಜ್ ಮೋಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಇದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಬೇರೆ ಕ್ಲಿಯರ್ ಕೇಸ್ ಸಿಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಕಮಿಟಿ ಮುಂದೆ ಬರಲಿ, ಅದು ನಿಜವಲ್ಲವೇ, ಏನೆಂಬುದು ಬರಲಿ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಕತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕ, ಮತ್ತು ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಇದು ಹೋಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಮಗೆ ಒತ್ತಾಯಮಾಡಿ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎರ್. ಶೀಕಂಠಯ್ಯ (ನಂಜನಗೂಡು).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ನಾಜೇಗೌಡರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಹಕ್ಕು ಭಾವ್ಯತೆಯ ಸೂಚನೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಮಾತು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು ಮತ್ತು ಬಹಳ ಗಂಭೀರವಾದದ್ದು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರು ಒಂದು ಶೆಲ್ಟರ್ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಇನ್ನೇನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದಿತ್ತು. ಇದು ಒಂದು ಹೇಡಿತನದ ಲಕ್ಷಣ. ಅಂಥ ಧೈರ್ಯ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಹಠಮಾರಿಗಳು, ಗೊಂದಲಕಾರರು ಎಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಿರಂಗವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬಹುದಿತ್ತು. ನಾವು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆವು. ಇದು ಪಿ ಎಲೆಜ್ ಮೋಶನ್‌ಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದುದು ಎಂದಾಗ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಸಭೆಯ ಹಕ್ಕುಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಲೋಪ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ತಾವು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೆಜ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಕಳಿಸಬೇಕು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ನಾಳೆ ಎರಿಗೂ ಒಂದು ಹಕ್ಕು ನಮಗೆ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಲಘುವಾಗಿ, ಹಗುರವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭವಿದೆ. ಇದು ನಮ್ಮ ಘನತೆಗೆ, ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕುದಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ಅವರ ಘನತೆಗೂ ತಕ್ಕುದಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri DIGAMBARA RAO B. KALMANKAR (Aland).—I want to support the privilege motion on one more ground.

Sri S R. KANTHI (Minister for Law and Parliamentary Affairs).—I would like to say that the Chair may look into the record.

Sri DIGAMBARA RAO B. KALMANKAR.—I do not want to take much time. My submission in support of this particular privilege motion brought forward by the Hon'ble Member Mr. Nanje Gowda is that we Hon'ble Members of this House, whether we are on this side or on the other side, have every right to speak and put up arguments before this August House. When that is being done, it is no good on the part of the Treasury Benches to express unkindly about it or say anything against what we say here. Whatever Hon'ble Member said in this House is in the proceedings and they are stated on matters before this House. If the Hon'ble Minister were to hold some different opinion or takes it very lightly and says whatever is said before this House is something which is not good or which should not have been said or which results in holding up the proceedings in this House is a wide remark passed by the Treasury Benches and thereby a breach of the privilege of the Hon'ble Members of this House is committed. My submission is, this matter may be sent to the Committee of privileges for consideration. It is a question of the privilege of Hon'ble Members of this House and by that statement a sort of encroachment is being made on the freedom of expression that is guaranteed in the Constitution. My submission is, this matter is a very serious one and it may be sent to the Committee of Privileges for consideration.

10-00 A.M.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, for taking action as a privilege motion, there should be an authentic statement. Merely because it has appeared in the Press, it is not authentic and there is no authenticity. So Sir, I would request that this question cannot be considered unless there is an authorised, authentic statement before the Chair. Saying that it has appeared in the press is no argument and it is no substitute for an authentic statement. I would therefore urge on the Chair that it should give due consideration to these facts. It is also a fact that the Chair cannot order the production of the statement or any record from the Upper House. These are the difficulties that are there.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The Hon'ble Minister for Parliamentary Affairs has raised a very queer issue altogether in this behalf. There are precedents. There are cases based exclusively on newspaper reports where notice is taken and further action is taken by the lower House. As we are aware, we know even very recently, in Kerala this subject came up and what appeared in the newspaper was the subject matter which was raised on the floor of the other House. Now to say for us to get an authentic copy will not do. As a matter of fact, I know that the Hon'ble Member applied for a copy of the authentic copy of the speech made and he was refused for the simple reason that he is not a member of this House. What transpired there and whether a member is at perfect liberty to take notice of what has appeared in the press, unless and until it is contradicted then and there by the concerned member. I for one cannot countenance the queer view, the strange

view taken by the Hon'ble Minister for Parliamentary Affairs. Therefore, what I am submitting is, in the interest of all concerned, it is better this matter goes before the privileges committee. Let there be an enquiry whether he did make a speech like that. All that will come before the Committee if the matter is referred to the Committee. It is a very fit case wherein, in order to maintain the dignity, prerogative of this House, the respect of this House, it should be gone into. After all, we on this side have not come here merely to make *galata*, although we sometimes create headache for the treasury benches. It was very strange indeed that the Hon'ble Minister should have thought of another forum where he thought he was well secured and free. When we learnt that matter, it was shocking to hear a Minister making such a preposterous statement before the House.

The Hon'ble Chief Minister said that we should not use unparliamentary language.....

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—There is no need to argue. I raised two points. One is that the Hon'ble Member in question is not a member of this House. It is a very important point. Secondly, can this House take any action against a Member of the other House ? That is another point.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Then it creates further problem. He is strengthening my case.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I am talking about the Parliamentary procedure. He is not a member of this House.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I have not yielded, Sir, I am holding the floor and I am speaking.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I raise a point of order. My point of order is whether this House is entitled to entertain a motion of breach of privilege against a member of the other House ? That is one question. The second question is: the statement of the Hon'ble Minister is not before the House and any statement that has appeared in the Press, can it be relied upon ? Sir, these are two very important questions for them to answer. The Hon'ble Member's argument is not correct. We have to look at it from a rational and parliamentary point of view.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, I have to answer that point of order. In the guise of a point of order, some point has been raised. I say that this House is at perfect liberty to take action even against an outsider. I can show any number of precedents. He is practically an outsider so far as we are concerned. By sheer dint of a constitutional provision, he has a right to come and squat here. Even then, whatever he does, we have a right to challenge and take notice of it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I reserve my ruling. The House is adjourned for half-an-hour.

The House rose at Ten Minutes past Ten of the clock to re-assemble at Forty Minutes past Ten of the Clock.

The House reassembled at Forty Minutes past Ten of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair.]

SRI M. NAGAPPA.—Now regarding the vital points that have been raised by the hon'ble Minister for Parliamentary Affairs regarding the jurisdiction of this House to take cognizance of the Privilege M tion that has been moved by my learned friend Mr. Nanje Gowda, I wish to submit that this House has got jurisdiction in this way. The first thing is as per Article 194 (3) of the Constitution which reads.

> "In other respects, the powers, privileges and immunities of a House of the Legislature of a State, and of the members and the committees of a House of such Legislature, shall be such as may, from time to time be defined by the Legislature by law, and, until so defined, shall be those of the House of Commons of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and of its members and committees, at the commencement of this Constitution."

Since we have made no legislation or law regarding privilege motion, we have to necessarily follow the precedents and customs prevailing in the United Kingdom, that is in the House of Commons. With reference to this, I submit that there are so many cases in which the matter has been dealt by the Parliament itself. First of all, I will refer to the case of Sundaraya in the year 1952. On the 12th July 1952, a complaint had been lodged before the Parliament that the member of the Council of States Sri Sundaraya had committed breach of privilege of the House of the People. Thereupon, action was taken and the matter was referred to the Privileges Committee. Accordingly, the matter was taken cognizance of before the House of People. Apart from that instance, there are so many instances of this kind and they have been taken congizance of.

Secondly, privilege also has arisen in one case. "On 26th March 1959, a member drew the attention of the House to a news-item appearing in "Samaj," an Oriya daily of Bhubaneshwar in its issue of March 18, 1959, wherein the Chief Minister of Orissa was alleged to have cast sweeping and general remarks against members of Parliament. The member said that the Chief Minister of Orissa and the Editor of "Samaj" might be called to the bar of the House to Explain their conduct or, in the alternative, the matter might be referred to the Committee of Privileges for investigation and repor . This extract I am reading from

"Practice and Procedure of Parliament." And this matter has been discussed in the Lok Sabha Debates dated 26th March 1959, Vol. Nos. 19 8 and 7969. There the point was that the Chief Minister was not responsible to the House of the people. There, there is a little difference. The hon'ble Speaker has given the following ruling.

> "If really the hon'ble Chief Minister has said what he is alleged to have said, it is regrettable...if it is really true, this ought not to be continued. I hope and trust that this wholesome priniciple will be followed everywhere—no House will cast any aspersion on any member of the other House or any other House in this way..."

So, there is a little difference between this case and the present case on hand. In that way, this ruling is not binding on this House. We have to follow the principles laid down by the House of Commons. For that, I submit that as per article 164 of the Constitution, the Ministers are jointly or severally responsible to the House. I put one point before this House. Supposing a member who is not a member of this House but a member of the Upper House and he is a Minister, he is also responsible to this House. Suppose a censure resolution or censure motion is adopted by this House on him, he has to resign because he is also responsible to this House. In the instance quoted by me some time back, the Chief Minister of Orissa was not responsible to the Parliament; that difference was there. Still the Speaker of the Lok Sabha ruled that what that Chief Minister said was regrettable and ought not to be continued to be indulged in. Now, under article 164 of the Constitution, this Minister is also responsible to this House as the Council of Ministers are responsible to the Assembly. Therefore, to say that he has not committed a breach of privilege on the ground that he is not a member of this House is not tenable. As Minister, he is also responsible to this House. If a censure motion is passed against him, he has to resign. If it is decided in this House that his remarks in the other House are against the interests of this House, definitely he has to obey the decision. Definitely he is responsible to this House.

If we follow the principle laid down by the United Kingdom, he cannot cast any aspersion on this House. Let me quote the relevant extract from the Seventeenth Edition of May's Parliamentary Practice. It has been noted on page 144 as follows:

> "Where the matter of complaint is a charge alleged to have been made by one Member against another in a speech outside the House, it is usual, if the Member admits the correctness of the report and states that he is in a position to prove the charge and is willing to attempt to do so, to give him an opportunity of establishing his charge and with this object to refer the matter to a committee....

(SRI M. NAGAPPA)

"Where the Member has refused either to withdraw the charges or to substantiate them, the House has sometimes adjudged him guilty of a breach of privilege, and dealt with him accordingly."

"Where the Member accused has made a proper apology for his offence, the incriminating motion has usually been withdrawn."

"In a recent instance after a complaint had been made in the Commons of a speech delivered (Outside the House) by a Member of the House of Lords, a motion was made to refer the matter to the Committee of Privileges, but was withdrawn after the Speaker had announced that he had received a letter of apology from the Peer concerned which he read to the House."

"When a member, officer or servant of either House has been guilty of any offence either against the other House or against its members, which would be punishable by the latter if committed by one of its own members, officers, or servants, it is the duty of the House to which such offender belongs, upon being apprised of the fact, to take proper measures to inquire into and punish the offence in a proper manner."

If this letter of apology is taken into consideration, definitely this House has the right to record the evidence and prepare the records against the Minister, irrespective of where he has made that statement. If that statement he has made affects the privilege of this House, after preparing the case, a reference may be made to the hon'ble Chairman of the Legislative Council for passing a sentence upon him there. Ultimately the Chairman of the Legislative Council has to take action on the reference made by this House and intimate the fact of having done so to this House. This House has every right to take into consideration the statement made by him in the other House, record evidence, prepare the papers and take up the issue with the Chairman, in accordance with the Parliamentary Procedure. We refer the matter to the Chairman who, in turn, has to only take action to the extent of passing a sentence on him and intimate that action taken by him to this House as the jurisdiction to take and consider this matter goes there also. He has made those remarks in the Upper House in his capacity as Minister and not in his individual capacity as Member of that House. Since he has made the comments in his capacity as Minister, I have already explained how, in his capacity as Minister, he is responsible to this House. Since he is responsible to this House, this House can take cognizance of his remarks in the Council. So, this matter may be referred to the Committee of Privileges. I have sufficiently met the matter raised by the hon'ble Minister regarding jurisdiction.

† Sri DIGAMBARA RAO B. KALMANKAR.—Page 398 Vol. II and Mookerji.

"A member of the House of Lords complained of certain words spoken about him by a member of the House of Commons in that House The House of Lords was of opinion that as the person complained against was a member of the other House and the words were said in that House, the House of Lords could not take any cognizance of what was spoken or done in the House of Commons 'unless it be by themselves in a parliamentary way made known to this House; neither could the person complained against be called to give reparation without breach of the privilege of Parliament unless the House of Commons consented to it."

On page 400: "A similar question was raised in the House of the People when a Minister who was a member of the Council of States was asked by the House of the People to explain his conduct.

There was some controversy between the two Houses but ultimately no decision was reached. Subsequently, the question of the procedure to follow in such cases was referred to a Joint Committee of the two Houses."

So, here it is a fact that the Hon'ble Minister who said these words is a member of the Upper House, What he said in that House is affecting the privileges of this House. The procedure to be followed in this case would be: The Presiding Officer shall refer the case to the Presiding Officer of the other House.

"Upon the case being so referred, the Presiding Officer of the other House shall deal with the matter in the same way as if it were a case of breach of privilege of that House or of a member thereof.

The Presiding Officer shall thereafter Communicate to the Presiding Officer of the House where the question of privilege was originally raised, a report about the enquiry, if any, and the action taken on the reference."

My submission is, the Presiding Officer of this House has ample power to taken up the matter and this matter can be referred to the Presiding Officer of the other House. Then, he will hold the enquiry and action may be taken. This is a very important matter and there are innumerable authorities to show that this question can be referred to a Joint Committee and a Joint Committee can also be appointed.

† Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, Hon'ble Members have referred to article 194 and 194 gives the freedom of speech in the House. That freedom cannot be questioned. But, there are two Houses in Mysore—the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council. Each House is supreme by itself. The rights and privileges of a member or any breach of privilege of any House has to be looked into by itself. Article 194

(SRI S. R. KANTHI)

does not give right to one House to look into the business of the other House. No action can be taken against a member for any statement made by him in the House; that is what 194 says; beyond that, 194 does not say that the proceedings of the Upper House will be amenable to the discipline of the Lower House or the proceedings of the Lower House will be amenable to the discipline of the Upper House. Sir, the House of Commons is there and the House of Lords is also there. Article 194 gives the rights and privileges of the House of Commons. Since we have not framed any rule in respect of rights and privileges, the rights and privileges of the House of Commons are available for both the Houses or for the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha. This being so, can anybody imagine that a member of the House of Lords makes a statement against members of the House of Commons? In that case, can anybody imagine that the members of the House of Lords are amenable to the discipline of the House of Commons? Similarly, the Upper House cannot be amenable to the discipline of the Lower House. That is very evident. What is the use of quoting article 194 which gives no power to the House?

Sir, the question was raised about the Chief Minister of Orissa for certain statements made by him. In that case the ruling is: "I am not going to give my consent for the reason that each House is supreme so far as its own proceedings are concerned". Sir, it is very clear. He goes on to say that if consent is to be given, the Chief Minister of Orissa is amenable to discipline of fourteen States and the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha.

If a statement has been made by my hon'ble friend the Minister for Co-operation, I submit, since he is a member of the other House, the other House can take disciplinary action and not this House.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, we are not concerned with Sri Nadgouda, Member, Legislative Counil in this House. We are only concerned with Sri Nadgowda Minister for Co-operation and Development. Otherwise, what transpires there or whether we have any right or not is a different matter. I want to categorically and specifically ask the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs whether the Minister is amenable to discipline of this House or whether this House has any control over him? Sir, to day he may take guise under the cover that he is not a member of this House. Because the Constitution enjoins a seat for him, he comes and sits here. Tomorrow he may come here and say something nonsense against the members of the other House sitting here. Sitting there, he may talk something worse against us, in this House. Simply because he is a member of that House, to say, we have no control, is not correct.

There are two things here. Here is a Press that reports that Sri Nadgouda, Minister for Co-operation, has stated something silly against members of the Opposition of this House. The question is,

either he said it or did not say it. If he has said it, he has Cast slur on us; if he has not stated it and if it is wrongly reported, then the Press is amenable for discipline.

11-00 A.M.

One of the two things must be correct. Either he has stated or he has not stated. Therefore, these things can be made known only when a committee goes into the matter. He cannot sit here but for the fact he is a Minister. He is here not merely as Sri P. M. Nadgowda Member, Legislative Council but Minister responsible to both the Houses. Therefore it is not a simple matter where we can slur over. If he comes here and says, well gentlemen, I tender my apologies, it is a different matter. But we are not going to ask that until and unless the guilt is proved. If there is no guilt, there is nothing but the press will be guilty. Therefore, one of the two things will be settled. We cannot go and ask for official records. I know what might have transpired or when the matter comes up he may say that he has not even said. In any view, this is not a matter where it can be just talked over. Now that you are seized of this matter, I request you to give a ruling taking as much time as necessary.

SRI S. R. KANTHI.—The hon'be members are mixing up things. First of all he said an offence is committed. If an offence is committed in Chitradurga, if you ask the Trial Judge at Bangalore to try it, is it possible? I do not for a moment say that what the hon'ble Minister for Co-operation is stated to have said in the other House is correct or not. That is a different thing altogether. I would not have gone into the question but for the fact that the hon'ble members on the other side are touchy about it. Both Houses being supreme, how can this House take away the right of the other House? How can the other House take away the right of this House? If there is cause of action that must be carried to the Upper House for investigation and taking action. That is quite clear. They say that he is guilty and he must be tried here. How can that be done? A man committing guilt in Chitradurga how can be tried in Belgaum court? The hon'ble member is mixing up things. He says that the Minister for Co-operation has made the statement and he is responsible to this House. He is responsible to this House so far as discharge of his duties as Co-operation Minister is concerned.

(Hon'ble member Sri M. Nagappa stood up)

I admire the intelligence of my friend Sri M. Nagappa. But of late he reads from the other side like the Urdu paper. He has grip over the entire thing but he misrepresents.

I appeal to you to consider firstly that this is not the case of a Minister stating something about his department. It is not a statement made in this House. This is a statement made in the other House. The Lok Sabha ruling is quite clear that both Houses are supreme in their discharge of their own proceedings. So, this House has no right to consider this question.

† Sri S. SIVAPPA.—The Minister for Parliamentary Affairs is misquoting the whole thing. The issue is simple. Sri P. M. Nada Gowda, Minister for Development and Co-operation, is a member of the Cabinet. He has two places. He sits in the Legislative Council as a member of the Legislative Council ; He comes to this House as Minister. This minister has joint responsibility. He is responsible to this House. Whatever statement he made either in this House or in the other House, he has made it not as Sri P. M. Nad Gowda, Member, Legislative Council, but as Minister for Co-operation and Development. While replying to something he has made remarks regarding the proceedings of this House, challenging or abusing. In our view those remarks affect the dignity of this House. So, if we do not take cognisance, who else can take cognisance of it ? He has cast a slur on our face ; when he has done so, where else the remedy lies ? Should you not take cognisance when somebody makes a serious charge against the proceedings and the manner and character of the members of this House ? We are not questioning the sovereignty of the Legislative Council. It is supreme and we are supreme. There is no doubt about it. But, Sri P. M. Nadgowda, as Minister, he has misused the powers of minister in speaking something nonsense in the Legislative Council. When he comes here, can you not ask him ? He enters this House as Minister and he participates in the debate as Minister. Sri P. M. Nadgowda can be questioned. You can ask him : " You Mr. Nadgowda, as Minister you have spoken something nonsense, derogatory to this House ". He cannot escape. As Sri Nagappa pointed out in page 145 of the May's Parliamentary Procedure, there is a clear instance.

> " In a recent instance after a complaint had been made in the Commons of a speech delivered (outside the House) by a Member of the House of Lords, a motion was made to refer the matter to the Committee of Privileges, but was withdrawn after the Speaker had announced that he had received a letter of apology from the Peer concerned which he read to the House."

This is a clear case to show that when another member of the House of Lords spoke something against the House of Commons, the matter was seized by the House of Commons and that particular member was sensitive enough. He immediately apologised and the whole matter was dropped. But, here is a case where they not only defend the action but they do not know the fundamental rights and the dignity of this House. They are trying to defend and it is most disgraceful to defend the action which is purposely and deliberately done to disregard the character of this House, and disfigure the character of the members of this House. So, Sir, with all vehemence at my command I say that either the concerned member must come and tender unconditional apologies to this House or this matter must be referred to the Privileges Committee and after the trial of that member you may refer it to the Legislative Council. That is a different thing. They can examine what course and procedure should be adopted.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH (Mudigere).—He has not made the statement on the floor of the Council as member of the Legislative Council. The Minister for Parliamentary Affairs was pleased to say that he is not amenable to the jurisdiction of this House because he has the right to sit in the Legislative Council and so this House cannot take action against him because he has the privileges there. My submission is, he has not made that statement as Sri Nadagowda, M. L. C. That has been made clear by Sri H. Siddaveerappa. He has definitely made this statement as the Minister for Co-operation while replying to certain questions. He is a member of this House also because he has got the right to sit in this House as a Minister. Therefore, the privileges available to him as a member of the Ligislative Council are not available to him here. He is subject to the jurisdiction of this House since he is one of the members of the Council of Ministers. Though that specific charge is against the Opposition, it is also against the whole House because what he has said is "ವೃಥಾ ಕಾಲಹರಣ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದಲ್ಲ ಗಲಾಟೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು" It is a reflection on the Chair also. He has said that the Speaker has allowed such things. He has brought in everybody taking advantage of his privilege as a member of the Council, but he has said it as a Minister and not as a member of the Legislative Council. Therefore, it is wrong to say that this House has no jurisdiction to question whatever he has said there. In fact, this House is quite supreme. The Press has got the right to make a fair reporting of the proceedings of this House and of the other House. It is not the case of the Government that the Press has misreported the proceedings of the other House. The proceedings of the other House may not be available to us today, but unless whatever is said is otherwise proved, we have to presume that the Press has fairly reported the proceedings of the other House. Otherwise, correction would have come from the Press. He has said that purely in his capacity as a Minister and he is within the jurisdiction of this House. The sovereignty of the House cannot be questioned and we are competent to take action against the Minister. He has not only committed breach of privilege of the members of the Opposition but of the whole House including the Speaker. He has said that we have been unnecessarily spending public money by carrying on deliberations here. This is not a matter to be treated lightly; it is a very serious matter. The Privileges Committee does not consist only of Opposition members; it will consist of all members of this House. Therefore, let the Committee go into the matter and verify whether he has made that statement and if he has not done that and if the Press found guilty of not reporting the Proceedings of the other House fairly, the Press will be responsible. We are expected to lay good precedents and not to behave in a way unbecoming of us. We have to make a clear distinction whether he has made the statement in the capacity of a Minister and made use of his position there and criticised this House. This is a matter where a fine distinction has to be made and only a committee can make this distinction. Nor can the Speaker say offhand that this is not a case fit for referring to the

(SRI K. H. RANGANATH)

committee. In my opinion, it is a fit case which require thorough investigation and it should be referred to a Privileges Committee.

† SRI S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, the Hon'ble the Leader of the Opposition referred to page 155 of May's Parlimentary Practice. I shall read for the benefit of the members the same two paragraphs which he read.

> "In a recent instance after a complaint had been made in the Commons of a speech delivered (outside the House).....

Mark the words 'outside the House' and not inside the House. Besides, House means two Houses of Parliament. It further reads :

> "...by a Member of the House of Lords, a motion was made to refer the matter to the Committee of Privileges, but was withdrawn after the Speaker had announced that he had received a letter of apology from the Peer concerned which he read to the House.
>
> When a member, officer, or servant of either House has been guilty of any offence either against the other House or against its members, which would be punishable by the latter if committed by one of its own members, officers, or servants, it is the duty of the House to which such offender belongs, upon being apprised of the fact, to take proper measurers to enquire into and punish the offence in a proper manner."

I repeat "it is the duty of the House to which the offender belongs to take proper measures, etc." The offender belongs to the Upper House and he has not uttered these words in the discharge of his duty as the Minister for Co-operation but as a member. Even if he has uttered these words in the discharge of his duty as a Minister, he has utter d them in the other House and May's Parliamentary Practice is quite clear that it is the duty of the House to which the offender belongs to take proper measures to investigate it and punish the offender in a proper manner.

SRI K. H. PATIL (Gadag).—I rise on a point of order, Sir. The Hon'ble Minister Sri Kanthi is dealing with the point as to which of the House is competent to take action if there is breach of privilege. Now we are at the stage of admitting the Privilege motion and referring it to a Privileges Committee. That Committee has to consider whether the Hon'ble Minister Sri Nadgouda has made that statement or whether the Press has wrongly reported the proceedings of the other House. The Ministry consists of all the Ministers including the Chief Minister and there is joint responsibility. The Hon'ble Minister Sri Nadgouda has made that statement there in the capacity of a Minister and not in the capacity of a Council Member, because a Council Member has no right to reply to aquestion put by an hon'ble Member of the Council. We are now at a preliminary stage where the point raised by the Hon'ble Minister Sri Kanthi is not relevant

Now, the matter has to be referred to the Privileges Committee only, and we have no other matter except that.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Here, we should understand the context in which the Hon'ble Minister is said to have made that reference to the members of this House. As is reported, the question appears to be about the introduction of a Bill, about a legislative measure. There, the Minister has said :

"ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ವೇಳೆ ಹಾಳು ಮಾಡದೆ ಸಹಕರಿಸಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿಧೇಯಕ ವನ್ನು ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಬಹುದು".

That means, had it not been for other interference we could do it much earlier.

"ಸಚಿವರಿಗೆ ವೇಳೆ ಇನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಿ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆ ! ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡಿ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಗದ್ದಲ, ಗುದ್ದಾಟ ಮಾಡಿ ವೇಳೆ ಕಳೆಯುಲಲ್ಲವೇ" ಅಂತ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

That means, for not having introduced some legislative measure, he has placed us in this position, saying : "where is the time for us, look at the opposition people, they are 'galata' people." I admire the way in which the Hon'ble Minister does ; like a village schoolmaster, though vanquished, he could argue.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Periyapatna).—Sir, I am surprised that there should be so much of discussion. It is also surprising that the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs should be creating confusion instead of pin-pointing the issue. The issue is clear that there has been a statement made by the Minister for Co-operation casting a reflection on a section of the members of this House. If it is not true, that is a different matter. It is open to the Minister concerned to make a statement that he has not made that statement. We are considering the merits of the case, and it cannot be disputed even by any stretch of imagination that this statement does cast a reflection on the members of this House. Whether he is a member of this House or not, he is a Minister under the Constitution, a Minister who is responsible for both the Houses. The point for consideration at this moment is, whether there is a prima facie case or not If it is the Chair's opinion that there is no *prima facie* case, that is a different matter. It is obvious, on the very face of it, that it does establish a *prima facie* case casting reflection on the members of the House, and you will have to permit a reference to the Privileges Committee. You, as custodian of the privileges; the dignity, the conduct and the respect of the members of this House, I take it that you are zealous about it. If you mean business, then the only thing left for the Speaker is to consider whether there is *prima facie* case or not. Let us go into the merits of the case. That stage comes, when the Privileges Committee has gone into the question and given its ruling and the matter comes before the House, then it is for us to debate on the merits or demerits. Therefore, without further discussiou on the matter, I would appeal to you that the matter may be referred to the Privileges Committee, and if the Chair otherwise directs, I am afraid the privileges of the members of this House is at stake.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have heard the hon'ble members. I have to apply my mind, because this is a very important matter. After thorough examination, I will have to consider whether the matter of privilege raised by the hon'ble Member Sri H. N. Nanje Gowda can be considered as a matter of privilege or not. I will reserve my Ruling.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S RESOLUTION *Re*: SUPPLY OF NITROGENOUS FERTILISERS TO THE FARMERS

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಎಂ. ಗುರೆಡ್ಡಿ (ಮುದ್ದೇಬಿಹಾಳ್).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೇ, ನಿನ್ನೆದಿವಸ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಾಗನಗೌಡರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಈ ಸೂಚನೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ನಮ್ಮ ಭೂಮಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನೈಟ್ರೋಜನ್‌ನ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇದೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ದೊರಕಿಸುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಮಹತ್ವದ ವಿಷಯ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೆ. ಈಗ ಹೊಸ ಪರಿಶೋಧನೆಗಳು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವಾಗ ಇದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಮೆನ್ಯೂರ್ ನಷ್ಟೆತ್ತ ಕೂಡ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಸೋಪಕರವಾಗಿ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಮಹತ್ವದ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ನಾವು ನೈಟ್ರೋಜನ್‌ಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಬೆಲೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ತರುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇವೆ. ರೈತರಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ದರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಂಡು ತಮ್ಮ ಭೂಮಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಯೋಗ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳ ದುಸ್ತರವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಹೊಸ ಶೋಧನೆಯೇನಿದೆ ಅಮೋನಿಯಂನ್ನು ಸೋಪಕವಾಗಿ ಪುರವಣಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಇದನ್ನ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಏಕೆ ಸ್ಥಾಪನ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು, ಅಂತಹ ಒಂದು ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ಹಾಕಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಾಗನಗೌಡರು ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾದವರಿಗೆ ರಕಮೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾದವರಾಗಲಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಅಂತೂ ಇದನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲೇ ಈ ಅಮೋನಿಯಂನ್ನು ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಉಚಿತ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀರಾವರಿ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಪ್ರತಿವರ್ಷ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಗೊಬ್ಬರ ಕೊಡದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಭೂಮಿ ಕೂಡ ಕೆಡುವಂತಹ ಸಂಭವ ಇದೆ. ಈಗ ಲಕ್ಷಾಂತರ ಎಕರೆ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ನೀರಾವರಿಯ ಕೆಳಗೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಗೊಬ್ಬರವನ್ನು ಪುರವಠಿ ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ನಮಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವಾಗಿದೆ. ಪುರವಣಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಆ ದುಬಾರಿ ಗೊಬ್ಬರವನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡು ಕೊಂಡು ಹಾಕುವ ಶಕ್ತಿ ರೈತನಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗಿನ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ನವೀನ ಒಕ್ಕಲುತನ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಅವಶ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಪಣ ಬೇಸಾಯದ ಭೂಮಿಯಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ಗೊಬ್ಬರವನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬಹುದು, ಪರಿಣಾಮ ಕಾರಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಾಗನಗೌಡರು ಹೇಳಿದರು, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ನೈಟ್ರೋಜಿನ್ ಕೊಡುವಂತಹ ಅಮೋನಿಯಾವನ್ನು ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಮಹತ್ವದ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಮಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಗೊಬ್ಬರದ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ, ಅಮೋನಿಯಂ ಸಲ್ಫೇಟ್, ಸೂಪರ್‌ಫಾಸ್ಫೇಟ್ ಮುಂತಾದುವುಗಳನ್ನು ತಯಾರುಮಾಡಲು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಫಾರಿನ್ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಚೇಂಜ್ ಕೂಡ ಅಗತ್ಯ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಲಿಕ್ವಿಡ್ ಅಮೋನಿಯಾ ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯವರಿಗೆ ತೀವ್ರ ಯೋಚನ ಮಾಡಲು ತಿಳಿಸಿರಿ ಮತ್ತು ಅದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಲಿಕ್ವಿಡ್ ಅಮೋನಿಯಾ ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿಲಿಂಡರ್ಸ್ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವೆ. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಉಕ್ಕಿನ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತಾ ಇವೆ, ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು, ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಅವರೂ ಕೂಡ ಸಿಲಿಂಡರ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಲೇಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಕೂಡ ಅಷ್ಟೊಂದು ತ್ರಾಸದಾಯಕವಾಗಲಿಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಕಾರಖಾನೆಯವರು ಈ ಕೆಲಸ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಬಹಳ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲ ಇವತ್ತಿನದಿವಸ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ ವಾರ್ ಫುಟಿಂಗ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಬೇಸಾಯಿದ ಪ್ರೊಡಕ್ಷನ್ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವಾಗ